REMARKS

Claims 2-13, 15, 16 and 25-27 are currently pending. Claims 1, 14 and 17-24

have been cancelled without prejudice. With respect to claims 17-24, applicants reserve

the right to prosecute these claims in a continuing application. (Canceling claims 17-24

merely simplify the issues for this Amendment, and should not be construed as an

endorsement to the outstanding rejections of these claims. Indeed, Applicants expressly

traverse the rejections of these claims.).

Claims 1 and 14 were rejected as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,028,733

(hereafter "Ulicki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection (see, e.g., comments

under Claim 2 below). Claims 1 and 14 were also rejected under 35 USC 101 as

claiming the same invention as claims 1 and 9 in US Patent No. 6,411,725. Applicants

have cancelled claims 1 and 14 for this reason alone. The 35 USC 101 based rejection

should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-13, 15, 16 and 25-27 stand rejected as being anticipated by Ulicki.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 in view of Ulicki

Claim 2 has been amended to generally recite the inventive combination of now

cancelled claim 1. Ulicki is not understood to teach or suggest such a combination as

previously recited in now cancelled claim 1. For example, while Ulicki may perform an

action (i.e., retrieval of a pictorial message) <u>in response to user selection,</u> Ulicki is not

understood to teach <u>*associating* the object information *with* an action,</u> in combination

with the other claim features. Indeed, Ulicki appears silent in this regard. (Claim 2 also

recites that the video signal is steganographically encoded with at least two identifiers,

each identifier corresponding to distinct video objects in frames of the video signal, and

each identifier being <u>*associated with actions*</u> relating to the corresponding video objects.

Ulicki is not understood to teach such a combination. At best, Ulicki may carry out a

user specified action (i.e., after keyboard entry of selection information), but Ulicki is not

understood to associate an identifier with an action relating to a corresponding video

object, in combination with the other features of claim 2.).

We also note that while Ulicki may contemplate placing pictorial displayable

messages in video, it is not understood to teach or suggest *steganographically encoding*

object information about a video object into a video signal, in combination with the other

features of the claim. The cited passages seem to deal with information (e.g., pictorial

images) storage, and not information hiding or steganographic encoding.

Claim 2 should be allowable for at least these reasons. Other deficiencies of

Ulicki need not be belabored at this time.

<u>Claim 3 in view of Ulicki</u>

Claim 3 has been amended to generally recite the features of now cancelled claim

1. Claim 3 should be allowed for this reason alone. (See the discussion of the cancelled

claim 1 features under the Claim 2 section above.).

Claim 3 also recites that the object information is *encoded in a watermark signal* that covers <u>a portion of screen area</u> of frames in the video signal *where the video object is located*. The cited passage of Ulicki (Col. 2, lines 7-16) is not understood to deal with <u>encoding information in a watermark signal</u>, in combination with the remaining features of the claim.

Claim 3 should be allowed.

Claim 4 in view of Ulicki

Claim 4 has been amended to generally recite the features of now cancelled claim 1. Claim 4 should be allowed for this reason alone. (See the discussion of the cancelled claim 1 features under the Claim 2 section above.).

Applicants note that the rejection of claim 4 (citing Col. 2, lines 7-16) seems at odds with the Office's rejection of claim 3 (also citing Col. 2, lines 7-16). Nevertheless, the cited passages are not understood to teach or suggest that object information for at least two different video objects in the video signal is *steganographically encoded in different portions of frames* of the video signals where the corresponding video objects are located, in combination with the other features of the claim.

Claim 4 should be allowed.

Claim 5 in view of Ulicki

Claim 5 has been amended to generally recite the features of now cancelled claim 1. Claim 5 should be allowed for this reason alone. (See the discussion of the cancelled claim 1 features under the Claim 2 section above.).

Claim 5 also recites that the object information <u>includes</u> screen location information indicating where the video object is located in the video signal. Ulicki's discussion of a "predetermined" portion does not teach that the object information <u>includes</u> screen location information. (Even, assuming *arguendo*, that the predetermined portion or location of the frame inherently suggests the location of the segment or object, as posited by the Office (see Office Action at page 4, lines 19-21), Ulicki still would not teach that the object information <u>includes</u> screen location information.)

Claim 5 should be allowed.

Claim 7 in view of Ulicki

Claim 7 has been amended to generally recite the features of now cancelled claim 1. Claim 7 should be allowed for this reason alone.

Claim 7 also recites that the object information is *encoded <u>in</u> a pre-recorded video object,* which forms part of the video signal. The cited passages (Col. 1, lines 55-68) are not understood to teach or suggest encoding object information in a pre-recorded video object.

Claim 7 should be allowed.

Claim 10 in view of Ulicki

Claim 10 has been amended to generally recite the features of now cancelled claim 1. Claim 10 should be allowed for this reason alone.

Claim 10 also recites that the video object is *encoded with the object information as part of a process of capturing the video signal of physical objects,* and the object

information pertains to the physical objects captured in the video signal. The cited

passage (Col. 2, lines 29-4[sic]) analyzes previously captured video (e.g., the scanning

heads retrieve the frame <u>containing</u> the selection message), and is not understood to teach

encoding the object information as *part of a process of capturing the video signal of*

physical objects, in combination with the other features of the claim.

Claim 10 should be allowed.

Claim 13 in view of Ulicki

Claim 13 has been amended to generally recite the features of now cancelled

claim 1. Claim 13 should be allowed for this reason alone.

As the Office correctly notes, the cited passage (Col. 3, lines 27-48) discuss

<u>randomly</u> selecting displayable messages. But claim 13 recites that the object

information is encoded for at least two different video objects *such that the object*

information is synchronized with corresponding video objects depicted in the video signal

during playback. The recited object information is not <u>randomly</u> selected; but, rather, is

synchronized with its corresponding video objects.

Claim 13 should be allowed.

Claim 15 in view of Ulicki

Claim 15 has been amended to generally recite the features of now cancelled

claim 14. Ulicki is not understood to teach or suggest such a combination as previously

recited in now cancelled claim 14. For example, Ulicki at Col. 5, lines 50-62 is cited for

executing an action associated with the video object information (see page 6 of the Office

Action, lines 19-20, citing retrieval action is performed upon selection of the bank

teller.). Respectfully, the cited passage is not understood to teach or suggest an action

<u>associated with</u> the video object information. Rather, the action seems associated with

selection information entered from a keyboard 34. Other deficiencies of Ulicki need not

be belabored at this time.

Claim 15 also recites that the video signal includes watermark information for at

least two different video objects in the video signal, and the *watermark information*

associates the video objects with object actions or information. The cited passage (Col.

8, lines 23-33, seems silent regarding watermarking information <u>associating</u> video objects

with <u>object</u> actions or object information.

Claim 15 should be allowed.

Claim 16 in view of Ulicki

We have carefully studied the cited passage of Col. 8, lines 23-33, and have not

found mention of two different video objects appearing in the same frame, nor "a

plurality of objects or fame segments are located within a video frames and the

watermark or frame identification encoded in the audio track provides frame number

information corresponding to each or the video objects...." as suggested on page 7 of the

Office Action. Instead the cited passage deals with an identification code for a particular

unique frame.

The combination of features recited in claim 16 should be allowed.

Claim 25 in view of Ulicki

In an analogous manner as to that discuss above with respect to some features of now cancelled claim 1, Ulicki is not understood to teach or suggest *associating object specific information <u>with</u> an action,* where the action is performed in response to user selection of the video object through a user interface while the video signal is playing, in combination with the remaining claim features. The cited passage at Col. 5, lines 40-46 describes selection information entered by a keyboard. Here, at best, the selection information (but not the object specific information) is associated with an action.

Applicants also question the Office's statement that the encoded identification data in the audio track is imperceptible by a human (citing Col. 8, lines 23-33). Again, we have carefully studied this passage and find no discussion of human imperceptible encoding.

Claim 25 should be allowed.

Claim 26 in view of Ulicki

Claim 26 recites that the object specific information includes an identifier and screen location of the video object. The cited passage at Col. 8, lines 29-36 would merely identify a frame, and not a screen location within a frame.

Claim 26 should be allowed.

Remaining Dependant Claims

Each of the remaining dependant claims is believed to be patentable in its own right, in additional to being dependent upon allowable base claims. Independent consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are planning to submit an Information Disclosure Statement and Form 1449 for consideration by the Office. The Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned if the IDS has not been matched with the file by the time the Examiner picks up this Amendment for consideration.

Conclusion

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the above-noted rejections and early passage to issuance are respectfully requested. (Applicant need not belabor the other shortcomings of the art at this time.).

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 503-495-4575 if any issue remains.

Date: May 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

23735
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Phone: 503-885-9699
FAX: 503-885-9880

By_____
Steven W. Stewart
Registration No. 45,133